DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 743 24 PS 005 023

AUTHOR Parker, Ronald K.
TITLE The Effectiveness of Special Programs for Rural Isolated Four-Year-Old Children: Wakulla County Preschool.
INSTITUTION Southeastern Education Lab., Atlanta, Ga.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Division of Educational Laboratories.
REPORT NO TR-2
BUREAU NO BR-6-2869
PUB DATE Mar 70
CONTRACT OEC-2-7-062869-3077
NOTE 95p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Caucasians; Cognitive Development; Concept Formation; Disadvantaged Groups; Enrichment Programs; Evaluation; *Language Development; Language Programs; *Mobile Classrooms; Negroes; *Preschool Programs; *Rural Education; School Readiness Tests; *Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS Peabody Language Development Kit

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this proposal was to evaluate two approaches to preschool education using a mobile laboratory as a classroom for rural 4-year-olds. The research data also provide an independent evaluation of the Peabody language development program. Three groups of eight 4-year-old children (N=24) attending the Readimobile Preschool program were matched with controls of the same age, race, sex, and socioeconomic status. Group 1 received a traditional general enrichment curriculum; Group 2 received lessons for 3 months from the Peabody Language Development Kit, Level P; Group 3 received instruction from the Peabody currciulum for 9 months. External evaluations of the three treated and three control groups were used to determine if differences existed among the groups on measures of intelligence, language, cognition, and school readiness. Each child was tested twice to provide information on test reliability on the Stanford-Binet, Caldwell Preschool Inventory, and the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA). All groups improved their performance on the second administration of the tests. Group 3 surpassed the scores of their controls on the Caldwell and Binet tests. Group 1 performed better than its control group on the ITPA. Group 2's performance did not surpass that of its control group on any measures. Tables and histograms comprise two-thirds of the document. (Author/AJ)

ED056743

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PA-24
BR-6-2869
OEC-2-7-062869-3077

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR RURAL ISOLATED FOUR-YEAR-OLD CHILDREN: WAKULLA COUNTY PRESCHOOL

Ronald K. Parker, Ph.D.
The Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

PS005023

Technical Report No. 2

March 1970

Southeastern Education Laboratory
3450 International Boulevard
Atlanta, Georgia 30354

Preface

The completion of this final report represents the cumulative contribution of two funding agencies and the help of many talented individuals. The Small Grants Program of the U.S. Office of Education (Grant No. OEG-4-9-190018-0030-057) and the research division of the Office of Economic Opportunity (Grant No. CAP-CG-9914) shared equally in providing financial support for the project.

The Southeastern Educational Laboratory and the Wakulla County School System provided the teaching staff and mobile classroom. The principal of the Wakulla County Schools, Mr. William Payne, is a public servant committed to providing the best in preschool education for the children of his county. Hopefully, this project is one step in the right direction to determine what is "best" for preschool children in Wakulla County, Florida.

Mr. Rex Toothman, director of the Preschool Program of the Southeastern Educational Laboratory, served as the administrative backbone of our efforts in Wakulla County, It was through his wise guidance that the program was launched and included a research component. Rex represents one of the "new breed" in early education with a strong commitment to empirical evaluations of preschool efforts. The Southeastern Educational Laboratory is fortunate to have Rex Toothman as the administrative head of their Preschool Program and this Wakulla research project profited in numerous ways through its association with Rex.

The daily classroom responsibilities were covered by two teachers, Peggy Gray and Lilian Taylor, and two observers, Margie Lewy and Bill Jennings. Peggy Gray is a master teacher of preschoolers and living proof of a paraprofessional's professional competence.

Dr. Joyce Roll coordinated the evaluation of the program. This was a difficult job which she handled masterfully. One additional person should be mentioned for a significant contribution during the evaluation; Mike Griffey aided the project in a dual role as tester and data manager. Additionally, Dr. Henry Lippert served as a valuable statistical consultant.

Lastly, two bright and professionally competent psychologists, Mary Carol Day and Sue Ambron, helped in preparation of this report. Dr. Helen Bee and Dr. Bill Sheppard were very helpful in offering constructive criticism of an earlier draft of this document.

This document was developed under the auspices of Southeastern Education Laboratory, a private non-profit corporation supported in part as a regional educational laboratory by funds from the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF HISTOGRAMS v

LIST OF TABLES vi

LIST OF FORMS xii

ABSTRACT 1

Purpose. 1
Contribution to Education. 1
Procedure. 1
Results. 1

INTRODUCTION 2

PROCEDURE 6

Evaluation 7

RESULTS. 10

Administration of Dependent Measures 10
Stanford-Binet Intelligence Quotient 11
Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities. 12
Subtests of the ITPA 13
Factor Analysis of the ITPA. 14
Caldwell Preschool Inventory 15
Englemann Concept Inventory Scale. 16
Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test. 16
Overview of Results. 16

DISCUSSION 18

REFERENCES 24

LIST OF HISTOGRAMS

Histogram — Page

1. A comparison of the three curricula groups, including their respective control groups, on the first and second administrations of the Caldwell Preschool Inventory 26

2. A comparison of the three curricula groups and their control groups on mean Stanford-Binet 10 scores 27

3. A comparison of the mean total ITPA scaled scores for each curriculum group and its control group 28

4. A comparison of the means of the General Enrichment group and its control group on the 12 subtests of the ITPA. 29

5. A comparison of the means of the Peabody 9-month group and its control group on the 12 subtests of the ITPA. . . . 30

6. A comparison of the means of the Peabody 3-month group and its control group on the 12 subtests of the ITPA. . . . 31

7. Comparisons of the means of the General Enrichment, the Peabody 9-month, and the Peabody 3-month groups on the 12 subtests of the ITPA 32

8. A comparison of the means of the Peabody 9-month group and the General Enrichment control group on the 12 subtests of the ITPA 33

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

1. Test-Retest Reliability Coefficients Between First and Second Administrations 34

2. Binet IQ - Second Administration: Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Difference Between Means. 35

3. Total ITPA Scaled Score - Second Administration: Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Difference Between Means. 36

4. Auditory Reception Scaled - Second Administration: Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Difference Between Means. 37

5. Auditory Association Scaled - Second Administration: Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Differences Between Means. 38

6. Visual Association Scaled - Second Administration: Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Differences Between Means. 39

7. Verbal Expression Scaled - Second Administration: Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Differences Between Means. 40

8. Manual Expression Scaled - Second Administration: Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Differences Between Means. 41

9. Visual Closure Scaled - Second Administration: Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Differences Between Means. 42

10. Auditory Sequential Memory Scaled - Second Administration: Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Differences Between Means 43

11. Visual Sequential Memory Scaled - Second Administration: Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Differences Between Means. 44

12. Auditory Closure Scaled - Second Administration: Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Differences Between Means. 45

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table | Page

13. Factor Analysis of ITPA Raw Scores (N=48). 46

14. Total Caldwell - Second Administration: Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Differences Between Means. 47

15. Caldwell - Second Administration Subtest 1: Personal-Social Responsiveness: Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Differences Between Means. 48

16. Caldwell - Second Administration Subtest 4: Concept Activation-Sensory: Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Differences Between Means. 49

17. Englemann - Subtest 2 Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Differences Between Means. 50

18. Englemann - Subtest 3 Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Differences Between Means. 51

19. Total Metropolitan - First Administration: Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Differences Between Means. 52

20. Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test - Subtest 1 Duncan's New Multiple Range Test of Differences Between Means. 53

21. Analysis of Variance of Binet I.Q. 54

22. Analysis of Variance of Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities Raw Score 55

23. Analysis of Variance of The Caldwell Preschool Inventory. 56

24. Analysis of Variance of Total Stanford-Binet IQ Scores (First Administration) 57

25. Analysis of Variance of Total Illinois Test of Psycholinguistics Abilities Scaled Scores (First Administration) 57

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
26.	Analysis of Variance of Visual Reception Scaled Scores (First Administration)	58
27.	Analysis of Variance of Auditory Reception Scaled Scores (First Administration).	58
28.	Analysis of Variance of Auditory Association Scaled Scores (First Administration).	59
29.	Analysis of Variance of Visual Association Scaled Scores (First Administration).	59
30.	Analysis of Variance of Verbal Expression Scaled Scores (First Administration).	60
31.	Analysis of Variance of Manual Expression Scaled Scores (First Administration).	60
32.	Analysis of Variance of Grammatical Closure Scaled Scores (First Administration).	61
33.	Analysis of Variance of Visual Closure Scaled Scores (First Administation).	61
34.	Analysis of Variance of Auditory Sequential Memory Scaled Scores (First Administration)	62
35.	Analysis of Variance of Visual Sequential Memory Scaled Scores (First Administration)	62
36.	Analysis of Variance of Auditory Closure Scaled Scores (First Administration)	63
37.	Analysis of Variance of Sound Blending Scaled Scores (First Administration)	63
38.	Analysis of Variance of Total Caldwell Scores (First Administration)	64
39.	Analysis of Variance of Caldwell--Subtest 1 Personal-Social Responsiveness (First Administration). .	64
40.	Analysis of Variance of Caldwell--Subtest 2 Associative Vocabulary (First Administration).	65

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
41.	Analysis of Variance of Caldwell--Subtest 3 Concept Activiation - Numerical (First Administration)	65
42.	Analysis of Variance of Caldwell--Subtest 4 Concept Activiation - Sensory (First Administration)	66
43.	Analysis of Variance of Total Englemann's and Beriter's Concept Development Scores (First Administration)	66
44.	Analysis of Variance of Englemann's and Bereiter's Concept Inventory Scale--Subtest 1	67
45.	Analysis of Variance of Englemann's and Bereiter's Concept Inventory Scale--Subtest 2	67
46.	Analysis of Variance of Englemann's and Bereiter's Concept Inventory Scale--Subtest 3	68
47.	Analysis of Variance of Englemann's and Bereiter's Concept Inventory Scale--Subtest 4	68
48.	Analysis of Variance of Total Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test (First Administration).	69
49.	Analysis of Variance of Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test--Subtest 1.	69
50.	Analysis of Variance of Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test--Subtest 2.	70
51.	Analysis of Variance of Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test--Subtest 3.	70
52.	Analysis of Variance of Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test--Subtest 4.	71
53.	Analysis of Variance of Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test--Subtest 5.	71
54.	Analysis of Variance of Total Stanford-Binet IQ Scores (Second Administration).	72

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
55.	Analysis of Variance of Total Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities Scaled Scores (Second Administration).	72
56.	Analysis of Variance of Auditory Reception Scaled Scores (Second Administration)	73
57.	Analysis of Variance of Visual Reception Scaled Scores (Second Administration)	73
58.	Analysis of Variance of Auditory Association Scaled Scores (Second Administration)	74
59.	Analysis of Variance of Visual Association Scaled Scores (Second Administration)	74
60.	Analysis of Variance of Verbal Expression Scaled Scores (Second Administration)	75
61.	Analysis of Variance of Manual Expression Scaled Scores (Second Administration)	75
62.	Analysis of Variance of Grammatical Closure Scaled Scores (Second Administration)	76
63.	Analysis of Variance of Visual Closure Scaled Scores (Second Administration)	76
64.	Analysis of Variance of Auditory Sequential Memory Scaled Scores (Second Administration).	77
65.	Analysis of Variance of Visual Sequential Memeory Scaled Scores (Second Administration).	77
66.	Analysis of Variance of Auditory Closure Scaled Scores (Second Administration).	78
67.	Analysis of Variance of Sound Blending Scaled Scores (Second Administration).	78
68.	Analysis of Variance of Total Caldwell Scores (Second Administration).	79
69.	Analysis of Variance of Caldwell--Subtest 1 Personal-Social Responsiveness (Second Administration)	79

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
70.	Analysis of Variance of Caldwell--Subtest 2 Associative Vocabulary (Second Administration)	80
71.	Analysis of Variance of Caldwell--Subtest 3 Concept Activation - Numerical (Second Administration).	80
72.	Analysis of Variance of Caldwell--Subtest 4 Concept Activation - Sensory (Second Administration).	81
73.	Correlations of The Subtests of The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (Second Administration - Scaled Scores).	82
74.	Correlations of the Subtests of The Caldwell Preschool Inventory (Second Administration).	83

LIST OF FORMS

Form		Page
1.	Performance Recording Sheet, Wakulla County Readimobile Preschool	84

Abstract

Purpose. The purpose of this proposal was to evaluate two approaches to preschool education using a mobile laboratory as a classroom for rural four-year-old children.

Contribution to education. The project provides a workable prototype of a mobile instructional unit to provide preschool education to young children in geographically isolated areas. Additionally, the research data provide a careful independent evaluation of one potentially valuable preschool language development program (Peabody).

Procedure. Three groups of eight four-year-old children attended the Readimobile Preschool program. Group 1 received a traditional general enrichment curriculum, consisting of films with supplementary introductory or follow-up activities, for 9 months. Near the end of the academic year, Group 2 received lessons for 3 months from the Peabody Language Development Kit, Level P. Group 3 received instruction from the Peabody curriculum for 9 months. Internal evaluations of Group 3 documented changes across time.

Each child in Groups 1, 2, and 3 was matched to a control child by age (within three weeks), race, sex, and socio-economic status. The control children lived in rural areas where no preschool program was available. External (posttest) evaluations of the three treated and three control groups were used to determine if differences existed among the groups on measures of intelligence, language, cognition, and school readiness. The Binet, Caldwell, and ITPA were administered twice to each child to provide information on test reliability for rural, culturally-deprived four-year-olds.

Results. All groups improved in performance on the second administration of the Binet, ITPA, and Caldwell. Analyses of variance using second posttest scores indicated that the Peabody 9-month (P9) group surpassed its control group on total Caldwell and Binet scores, while the general enrichment (GE) group performed better than its control group on the total ITPA. The Peabody 3-month (P3) group did not perform better than its control group on any measures.

When different curricula groups were compared, the P9 group and GE group did not differ on total scores of the Binet and Caldwell. The GE group did surpass the P9 group on total ITPA score, but there was no difference between scores of the P9 group and the GE control group, which scored higher than the two Peabody control groups and the P3 group.

Introduction

During the last decade numerous federal and state agencies have developed programs designed to improve the lives of socio-economically disadvantaged Americans. Special assistance has come through increased job opportunities, medical aid, social services, and educational programs. The young child represents the target population for both preventative (e.g., Schaefer, 1965) and remedial (Gordon, 1967) educational programs designed to modify the effects of poverty on the individual.

Support for the interest of early childhood educators and psychologists in modifying the cognitive-intellectual abilities of young children has a base in contemporary theorizing (Hunt, 1961) and the empirical research literature (Elkind, 1967). Hunt (1961) carefully outlines a conception of intelligence in which intelligence is not viewed as constant, nor is it necessarily doomed to develop in a fixed, unmodifiable way. Considerable data are cited to support the contention that intelligence and intellectual development can be modified by means of environmental events. On a more applied level, programs like Project Head Start are based on the assumption that preschool experiences can facilitate school performance of the young socio-economically disadvantaged child.

The rapid growth of preschool educational programs in North America (Reidford, 1968) dramatically underscores the major problem of preschool education today: it is an edifice without a foundation! More specifically, due to the lack of research designed and conducted with sufficient scientific rigor to yield useful information in the area, we can only make educated guesses about the important variables that influence cognitive and intellectual development during the preschool years (White, 1968). The current lack of scientific information stems from two sources, one historical and one contemporary. Historically, little research was conducted on preschool programs except for those investigations of kindergarten programs for socio-economically advantaged children (Swift, 1964). Almost all of this early research suffered on several important counts (e.g., confounded experimental design), so that generalizations about the merits of nursery school attendance cannot be made because of the inconclusive and contradictory research data.

The contemporary status of preschool education presents a somewhat mixed picture. Numerous psychologists and educators are turning their attention to the general area of preschool education and to the specific area of preschool education for socio-economically disadvantaged children (Deutsch, Katz, & Jensen, 1968; Helmuth, 1967; Hess & Bear, 1968; Webster, 1966). However, at the same time, hundreds of preschool programs exist that either have no clear statement of curriculum and/or do not have an adequate evaluation component. These efforts are, therefore, basically useless in contributing to a scientific understanding of the important variables in preschool education.

Parker, Ambron, Danielson, Halbrook, and Levine (1970) have recently completed a comprehensive overview of preschool programs for three-, four-, and five-year-old children which focus on language and/or cognitive skills. Their overview is divided into three sections: (1) programs which specify their curricula and provide empirical evaluations of the programs; (2) "emerging" programs which appear promising but are not yet complete in terms of clearly specified curricula and empirical evaluations; and, (3) "components" of programs which appear promising even though the components lack comprehensiveness.

Although the programs included in the overview represent a valuable initial step, the major problem of preschool education remains that of building a strong foundation based on empirical research. The following four-step approach appears to be a reasonable plan: (1) to continue developing prototype preschool curricula from various theoretical positions; (2) to design instructional systems to implement these curricula (e.g., multimedia, use of paraprofessionals, etc.); (3) to carefully evaluate these curricula before premature widespread adoption; and (4) to develop imaginative procedures to implement curricula in special settings with different populations (e.g., rural children, school system with low budget, advantaged and disadvantaged children, etc.).

The Southeastern Educational Laboratory started a "readimobile" program during the 1967-68 school year (Toothman, 1968). The program's purpose is to "design, field test, and demonstrate the application of a mobile instructional unit in providing readiness experiences to preschool age children in geographically isolated areas." The following guidelines exist for comparable implementation of the Readimobile program in six Southeastern locations:

1. Sites should be located which provide easy access to the Readimobile for groups of about 15 children.

2. The Readimobile program should visit each site twice weekly.

3. Exclusive of Readimobile travel and preparation in time, each stop should be two hours in length.

4. Each Readimobile should be staffed by two paraprofessionals (indigenous high school graduates).

In Wakulla County, Florida (the poorest county in Florida in terms of per capita income), the Readimobile stops at five locations--Shadeville, Sopchoppy, Crawfordville, Panacea and Buckhorn. The usual weekly Readimobile "Curriculum" can best be described as general cultural enrichment experiences provided basically through the use of films with supplementary introductory or follow-up activities.

In June of 1968, Mr. Rex Toothman, Director of the Readimobile Program, asked me to react to the program. The essence of my comments

can be summarized as follows: The program, while possibly providing a socialization function and serving to develop positive interpersonal relations, will probably fail to have any meaningful impact on the disadvantaged participants' cognitive-intellectual-language development and consequently his "readiness" for school. The general cultural enrichment experiences appear as vague and unstructured as those of similar programs that have failed to improve school readiness (Alpern, 1966).

These comments, focusing on cognitive variables, are not meant to minimize the importance of gains in areas such as social-emotional development. Bereiter and Englemann (1966), however, provide convincing arguments for focusing on specific deficits (e.g., language behavior) of the disadvantaged children during the brief preschool day. Their argument, simply put, is that we cannot help these children in all areas of development, so we must concentrate on those areas most likely to have high pay-off in terms of stimulating cognitive-intellectual-language development and, consequently, school readiness.

The objective of the present research was to evaluate and compare two procedures for providing preschool education to rural four-year-olds by using a mobile lab. One of the procedures was the previously employed general enrichment curriculum. The Peabody Language Development Kit (PLDK), Level #P, was selected as the other curriculum for two reasons: (1) it is easy for paraprofessionals to use and (2) it presumably focuses on language skills. The PLDK model was built on Osgood's linguistic theory (1957) which also formed the base of the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (Kirk & McCarthy, 1961). The theoretical model on the nature and training of human intellect by Guilford (1967) was drawn upon in addition to the work of Torrance (1962) in the area of creative thinking. In all four levels (Level #P, #K, #1, and #2) the training of global oral language rather than specific training on selected psycholinguistic processes is stressed. While activities exist for all three components of language, namely reception, expression, and conception, in Level #P stress is placed on auditory reception and on vocal expression. Emphasis is placed on the establishment of an automatic level of sentence structure reflecting basic syntactical rules.

The rationale for the Kits was based, as well, on theory and research related to verbal learning (McGeoch & Irion, 1952). An attempt was made to cast the lessons in keeping with the behavior modification techniques of Skinner (1957). In addition to the use of tangible and token reinforcements, motivation was built in (1) by having many of the daily lessons contain an activity which allowed for free movement on the part of the group; (2) by providing attractive full-color pictures as well as novel and intriging records, puppets, magnetic shapes and other materials; (3) by pacing the activities so as to move on when interest lagged; (4) by having as many as possible of the children engaged in all activities at all times; and (5) by selecting elements which were found in field testing to be of high interest value to most children for whom this level of the Kit was devised. The various aspects of language taught by the lessons were programmed for increasing difficulty, though future field testing will probably demonstrate the need for further

refinements in this regard. Finally, behavior theory and research was called upon in building overlearning into the lessons (Ellis, 1963; Vergason, 1964).

No attempt is made here to review the research on the Peabody Language Development Kits. This literature is carefully summarized in the manuals of the appropriate level of the Kits. Levels #K, #1, and #2 of the PLDK series appear to be effective in stimulating oral language development. The evidence is less clear on the usefulness of the lessons in training intellect and enhancing school achievement--with some notable successes in both cases.

The research to date on Level #P of the Peabody Language Development Kits has been based on the experimental version of the Kit and only on the first part of that version. Generally, the findings were heartening in terms of stimulating overall growth in oral language and verbal intelligence. However, the experimental edition did not stimulate grammatical-syntactical aspects of language to the extent desired. Therefore, in developing the final version, a much heavier concentration of exercises was included in this area and a series of songs was devised to make certain syntactical rules automatic. Too, the final edition was expanded by about one-third. Each of the 180 daily lessons was divided in a Part A and a Part B, with two activities generally provided in each. Thus, the Kit now contains what could be described as 360 sub-lessons. It is hoped that the increased emphasis on syntax and the extension of the training program will overcome weaknesses discerned in the experimental edition. It remains for future research to advance knowledge about the effectiveness of the Kit in its present form, especially with regard to fostering grammatic skills in disadvantaged and retarded children. The present research will provide an independent evaluation of Level #P using rural four-year-old disadvantaged children as subjects.

In summary, the purpose of this project was to investigate the effectiveness of a structured psycholinguistically based preschool curriculum (PLDK-P) on disadvantaged black four-year-old children. One group received instruction across a nine-month school year while another group received instruction for only three months. Additionally, the performances of these two groups were compared to the performance of a group of advantaged (by local standards) white children receiving the general enrichment curriculum of the Readimobile. Even though race and curricula are experimentally confounded when comparing these three groups, our interest in adding the white children was to provide local "norms" for comparison purposes. In essence, we were wondering if our structured treatments would mask the often reported differences between black and white children on a variety of dependent measures.

ED 050 623

Procedure

Three groups of eight four-year-old children served as the treated population in this study. Group 1, receiving the general enrichment curriculum, was represented by children who participated in the standard 1968-1969 Readimobile Program at the Panacea location in Wakulla County. A second group (Group 2) of the children at the Buckhorn location received lessons from the Peabody Language Development Kit, Level #P (American Guidance Service, 1968) for the last three months of the 1968-69 program. Group 3, also receiving the structured curriculum, was represented by the children who participated in the 1968-69 Readimobile Program at the Shadeville location using the Peabody Language Development Kit for 9 months. The children in Group 1 were white children from families with a median income of $4,500 and whose parents had a median of 12 years of education. The children in Groups 2 and 3 were black children whose families' median income was below $3,000 and whose parents had a median education of 8 years. Each group was composed of five males and three females.

Each child in the treated population was matched with an untreated control child with respect to age (within three weeks), race, sex and socio-economic status. The control population was obtained from rural portions of adjoining Leon and Gadston Counties, which do not have a preschool program. None of the control children had ever attended a nursery school or any type of preschool program.

The programs for Groups 1 and 3 started in September, 1968, and continued until June, 1969. The program for Group 2 lasted from March, 1969, until June, 1969. The Readimobile paraprofessional teachers, Mrs. Gray and Miss Taylor, were the same for all three groups.

Contact hours for Group 1 were 8:00 - 12:00 a.m. on Wednesday mornings. The daily schedule was quite flexible with a general enrichment curriculum including films with supplementary, introductory or follow-up activities. At the end of the 9-month program, the contact hours totaled 144.

The contact hours for Group 2 (Peabody curriculum for three months) were 8:00 - 12:00 a.m. on Friday mornings with a schedule similar to that of Group 3, only including more lessons due to the four hours of contact in one day rather than four hours divided over two days. Group 2 met for a total of 48 hours of contact during the three months.

The contact hours for Group 3 (Peabody curriculum, ninemonths) were 9:00 - 11:00 a.m. on Tuesday and Thursday mornings. A typical day's schedule is outlined as follows:

9:00 - 9:20	Peabody Lesson 14A
9:20 - 9:40	Peabody Lesson 14B

9:40 - 10:00	Outside structured Play (e.g., learn parts of the body, concepts such as near -- far, up -- down, etc. while playing)
10:00 - 10:20	Peabody Lesson 15A
10:20 - 10:40	Peabody Lesson 15B
10:40 - 11:00	Remedial work on earlier lessons.

Since Group 3 met only twice per week, the children did not cover all of the 180 lessons of the Peabody Kit during the nine months. However, Group 3, like Group 1, met for a total of 144 contact hours.

Evaluation

Both internal and external evaluations were employed to document the changes across time of Group 3 (Peabody curriculum, nine months) and to determine if differences existed among the three treated groups and the three untreated groups on measures of intelligence, language, school readiness, and cognition.

Internal Evaluation. The internal evaluation of Group 3 (Peabody Curriculum) was accomplished by having two observers (Miss Lewy and Mr. Jennings) record each child's responses to the Peabody lessons (see Madsen & Madsen, 1970, for procedures). These data were to serve two purposes: (1) to document attainment levels of each child throughout the year and (2) to serve as diagnostic data for the teachers. With regard to the first purpose, this approach provided accurate, up -to-date records on each child's learning progress on each concept, skill, or task, and enabled identification of the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum materials on this subject population. For example, how many "trials" were necessary for these children to learn the meaning of "under -- over," "up -- down," "big --little." Many of these concepts and tasks were presented as twenty minute lessons, yet much more time was needed to teach many of the daily objectives.

The second purpose of the internal evaluation, diagnosis of attainment levels, enabled the teachers to group the children on each occasion to capitalize on past learning. For example, consider the problem of teaching children to identify (receptive language) and name (productive language) the primary colors. Initially, none of the children could identify or name more than one color accurately. After only two sessions, our records indicated that five children had made rapid progress in color identification and naming. These children were then advanced to more challenging tasks, while the remaining children continued the elementary review on color concepts. This was a deliberate attempt to maximize the use of the child's time since the "Readimobile Preschool" only lasted four hours each week. This was, of course, the essence of some experiments in individually prescribed instruction (ERIE, 1968) and the approach taken in computer assisted instruction (Hansen, 1966). In this regard,

our daily diagnosis and structured approach to preschool education was instituted to insure that these children in four hours per week had more opportunities for specific learning than children in a conventional preschool setting that meets three hours daily or fifteen hours per week.

External Evaluation. The external evaluation represents the more traditional approach in which children are assigned to groups and given or not given a treatment (independent variable), after which the effects of the experimental or control placement are assessed (dependent variable). The children were evaluated in May and June of 1969, using the following instruments:

Intelligence:	Stanford-Binet
Language:	Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (Revised form, 1968)
Behavior Inventory:	Caldwell Preschool Inventory
Cognition:	Englemann's and Bereiter's Concept Inventory Scale
School Readiness:	Metropolitan Readiness Tests

The above five tests were administered on a posttest only basis. Three of the instruments--the Stanford-Binet, the ITPA, and the Caldwell --were administered a second time to each child within one month of the first administration of each instrument. The purpose of the second posttest was to determine the test-retest reliability with this particular population.

In terms of experimental design, there were at least two major flaws with the present research--lack of random assignment of Ss to groups and lack of pretest scores on groups. The external evaluation did not follow a random assignment of Ss to treatment groups and a pre-test-posttest design for two reasons. First, the group composition was determined by where the Readimobile stopped, and there was no opportunity to randomly assign children to location. Second, pretests were not administered because there were no funds available for pretesting. It is probably true, however, that the lower-class black children in rural Wakulla, Leon and Gadston Counties form a relatively homogenous group since poverty is so widespread in Northern Florida among rural blacks.

Particular caution was exercised in evaluating the distal control subjects. Much research exists emphasizing that non-intellectual variables, such as rapport between the examiner and child, markedly influence children's responses in testing situations (Bereiter & Engelmann, 1966; Glick, 1968; Zigler & Butterfield, 1968).

The following precautions were taken to increase the probability that our test results were valid:

1. A team of experienced examiners was hired.

2. The race of the examiner was the same as the child's race.

3. The Readimobile children (Groups 1, 2 and 3) were tested at their usual preschool sites.

4. The control children were tested in some suitable location in their homes. (An attempt was made to test the first two control children in a near-by elementary school, but the children became upset and did not respond well to the test items.)

5. Each child received a maximum of 45 minutes of testing per day to avoid fatigue and restlessness. Frequent rest breaks were also provided.

6. The examiner devoted the amount of time necessary to establish rapport with each child. Particular caution was used with the control children.

Teacher Training. The teacher training consisted of direct observation of teacher behavior in the structured curriculum setting, Group 3. The fundamental question was: Can bright high school graduates who are highly motivated be taught the principles of behavior modification and how to implement a "packaged" preschool curriculum? The teacher training program was as follows:

1. Didactic orientation. This included reading and discussion of the use of behavior modification principles (Madsen & Madsen, 1970), needs of the socio-economically deprived preschool child, and rationale for the Peabody lessons.

2. Role modeling. During September and October, the research director (Parker) and the observers (Jennings and Lewy) demonstrated how each lesson was to be used with children. After that time, the teachers were responsible for introducing the lessons.

3. Planning daily activities. After four months (September, October, November, December) the teachers slowly assumed more and more of the responsibility for planning and sequencing each day's activities.

Results

Throughout the remainder of this paper the following code will be used to differentiate the curricula groups and their controls.

	Experimental	Control
General Enrichment	GE	GE-C
Peabody - 3 months	P3	P3-C
Peabody - 9 months	P9	P9-C

Analysis of variance tables, tables summarizing the Duncan's Multiple Range Test, and all other tables are in the appendix.

Administration of Dependent Measures

The Binet, ITPA, and Caldwell were administered as posttests on two separate occasions in order to determine the stability (i.e., reliability) of these test scores on this population of Ss. The test-retest reliability coefficients between the first and second administration of the Binet, ITPA, and Caldwell total batteries and subtests were large and statistically significant (Table 1).

In order to investigate the effects of first or second administration on posttest scores, a 2 x 3 x 2 analysis of variance was computed on each dependent measure. Each analysis included the following variables: Treatment (Experimental vs. Control) x Curriculum (GE, P3, P9) x Administration (Initial Posttest vs. Second Posttest). Tables 21, 22, and 23 present the results of these analyses.

The results can be briefly summarized as follows: (1) the experimental Ss were superior on all measures on both occasions to the control Ss; (2) the treatment groups differed significantly from one another (these two findings are to be thoroughly discussed later in the results section); (3) the Ss in all groups scored significantly higher on the second administration of the measures (second posttest) than on the first administration (initial posttest); and (4) there was a significant Curriculum x Administration interaction on the Caldwell measure.

Since the Ss in all groups scored higher on the second administration of the posttest measures than on the first administration, a comparison of the mean scores for the groups on each measure should be enlightening.

On the Binet, the IQ scores for the experimental Ss were 97.00 and 100.58; the control Ss scored 86.79 and 90.92. In each case the gain was approximately 4 IQ points. On the ITPA, the scaled scores for the experimental Ss were 377.46 and 396.67; the control Ss' mean scores were 348.04 and 360.12. The gains for the experimental and control Ss were approximately 19 and 12 score points respectively. On the Caldwell, the scores for scaled experimental Ss were 49.20 and 53.88; the control Ss mean scores were 41.04 and 45.54. While the gains were approximately 5 points for both the experimental and control Ss, the interaction between the curricula groups and the administration of the Caldwell provides the opportunity for a more refined examination of these data. Figure 1 presents this interaction, revealing a dramatic increase in performance of the P3 group between the first and second administration of the Caldwell.

All groups improved in performance on the second administration of of Binet, ITPA, and Caldwell; therefore, the subsequent analyses used scores obtained on the second administration of these tests (i.e., the second posttest).

In addition, correlation coefficients revealed high positive correlations among the Binet, the ITPA, and the Caldwell. Correlations obtained on total scores on the second posttest were as follows: Binet and ITPA, $r = .801$; Binet and Caldwell, $r = .707$; ITPA and Caldwell, $r = .525$.

Stanford-Binet Intelligence Quotient

An analysis of variance of the Stanford-Binet IQ scores on the second posttest revealed that there were main effects of treatment and curriculum. There was almost a 10 point difference between the means of the treatment groups ($\bar{X} = 100.58$) and the control groups ($\bar{X} = 90.92$). In Figure 2 the mean IQ of each of the six groups is depicted.

The Duncan's New Multiple Range Test was applied to the means of the six groups (see Table 2). The GE group ($\bar{X} = 108.13$) scored significantly higher than the P3 group ($\bar{X} = 93.00$), the P3-C group ($\bar{X} = 87.38$), and the P9-C group ($\bar{X} = 84.63$). However, there were no significant differences between the GE group, the GE-C group ($\bar{X} = 100.75$), and the P9 group ($\bar{X} = 100.63$). The GE-C group scored significantly higher than both Peabody control groups.

These results reveal differences in the effectiveness of the GE and P9 curricula on their respective populations. The children involved in the GE curriculum did not score significantly higher on the Stanford-Binet than did their controls, while children in the P9 curriculum did score significantly higher than their controls. Since the mean IQ's of the two Peabody control groups were significantly lower than the mean IQ of the GE-C group, it is of note that (1) the P3 and P9 groups were

not significantly different from the GE-C group and (2) the P9 group was not significantly different from the GE curriculum group as well as the GE-C group.

Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities

An analysis of variance of the sum of the ITPA scaled scores on all 12 subtests indicated that there were main effects of treatment and curriculum. The mean for the treatment group was 396.67 and for the control group 356.79. Duncan's Multiple Range Test (Table 3) showed that the GE group ($\bar{X}$ = 477.13) scored significantly higher than all other groups. The GE-C group scored significantly higher than both Peabody control groups and the P3 group. However, the scores of the GE-C group ($\bar{X}$ = 415.75) and the P9 group ($\bar{X}$ = 376.13) were not significantly different. Thus it appears that both the GE and the P9 curricula were effective in increasing language skills.

Figure 3 illustrates the comparison of the mean sum of ITPA scaled scores for each curriculum group and control group. ITPA scaled scores rather than psycholinguistic ages were used because the examiner's manual for the ITPA gives composite psycholinguistic age norms based only on 10 subtests rather than on the 12 subtests comprising the total ITPA test battery used in this study.

Subtests of the ITPA

Figures 4, 5 and 6 compare each curriculum group with its control group on the twelve subtests of the ITPA. It can be seen in Figures 4 and 5 that the GE group and the P9 group had a higher mean profile than did their respective control groups. Figure 6 demonstrates that the P3 group did not have a higher profile than its control group. Apparently, the Peabody curriculum did not significantly increase language skill when implemented for only three months.

Figure 7 compares the profiles of the three curricula groups. The GE group obtained the highest mean profile. The P9 group obtained a slightly lower profile and the P3 group had the lowest mean profile. However, it is interesting to note the similarity of the P9 profile and the GE-C profile (Figure 8).

Analyses of variance were applied to scores from each of the subtests, and where significant effects were indicated, the Duncan's Multiple Range Test was used.

The Auditory Reception subtest analysis revealed a main effect of curriculum. The GE group ($\bar{X}$ = 38.75) scored significantly higher than the P3 group ($\bar{X}$ = 30.75) and both Peabody control groups ($\bar{X}$'s: P3-C = 32.00, P9-C = 32.38). However, the GE group, the P9 group ($\bar{X}$ = 35.63), and the GE-C group ($\bar{X}$ = 35.50) were not significantly different.

There were no significant differences between groups on the Visual Reception subtest.

The analysis of the Auditory Association subtest revealed significant differences between curricula groups. The Duncan's test (Table 5) indicated that the GE group ($\bar{X}$ = 37.00) scored significantly higher than both Peabody control groups ($\bar{X}$'s: P3-C = 29.63, P9-C = 28.25) and the P3 group ($\bar{X}$ = 28.88). However, the GE group did not demonstrate better auditory association than the GE-C group ($\bar{X}$ = 32.88), or the P9 group ($\bar{X}$ = 32.00).

The Visual Association analysis indicated a main effect of treatment (Table 6). The GE group ($\bar{X}$ = 40.75) scored significantly higher than all other groups except for the P9 group ($\bar{X}$ = 38.00). The P9 group scored significantly higher than either Peabody control group ($\bar{X}$'s: P3-C = 30.00, P9-C = 30.75).

A main effect of treatment was indicated on the Verbal Expression subtest (Table 7). All curricula groups scored higher than all control groups. The only significant difference revealed by the Duncan's test was between the P9 group ($\bar{X}$ = 39.38) and its control group ($\bar{X}$ = 33.13).

On the scores of the Manual Expression subtest, the analysis of variance indicated a significant effect of treatment (Table 8). The GE group ($\bar{X}$ = 40.13) scored significantly higher than both Peabody control groups ($\bar{X}$'s: P3-C = 32.88, P9-C = 32.88).

There were no significant differences between treatment or curricula groups on the Grammatical Closure subtest.

The Visual Closure analysis showed main effects of both treatment and curriculum. The Duncan's indicated a significant difference between the GE group ($\bar{X}$ = 61.25) and all other groups (Table 9). There was also a significant difference between the P9 group ($\bar{X}$ = 48.13) and its control group ($\bar{X}$ = 39.25).

A main effect of curriculum was revealed by the analysis of the Auditory Sequential Memory subtest. The Duncan's showed that the P9 group ($\bar{X}$ = 42.50) scored significantly higher than any of the control groups or the GE group (Table 10).

In the Visual Sequential Memory analysis effects of both treatment and curriculum were significant. The GE group ($\bar{X}$ = 40.13) scored significantly higher than both Peabody control groups ($\bar{X}$'s: P3-C = 31.00, P9-C = 27.63) and the P3 group ($\bar{X}$ = 28.75). There was no significant difference between the GE group and its control group ($\bar{X}$ = 34.50) or the P9 group ($\bar{X}$ = 35.38).

Type of curriculum produced significantly different scores on the Auditory Closure subtest. The GE group ($\bar{X}$ = 35.88) scored significantly higher than all groups except its control group (Table 12).

There were no significant differences among the groups on the Sound Blending subtest.

To summarize the analysis of the ITPA:

1. The GE group scored significantly higher than its control group on:
   A. Visual Closure
   B. Visual Association
   C. Total Score

2. The P9 group scored significantly higher than its control group on:
   A. Visual Association
   B. Verbal Expression
   C. Visual Closure
   D. Auditory Sequential Memory
   E. Visual Sequential Memory

3. The P3 group did not score significantly higher than its control group.

4. The GE group scored significantly higher than the P9 treatment and control groups on:
   A. Visual Closure
   B. Auditory Closure
   C. Total Score

   The P9 group scored significantly higher than the GE group on Auditory Sequential Memory.

5. The GE group scored significantly higher than the P3 treatment and control groups on:
   A. Auditory Reception
   B. Auditory Association
   C. Visual Association
   D. Visual Closure
   E. Visual Sequential Memory
   F. Auditory Closure
   G. Total Score

6. There was no significant difference between the GE control children and the P9 group except for Auditory Sequential Memory, on which the P9 group scored significantly higher.

Factor Analysis of the ITPA

The raw scores of the 12 subtests of the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities were subjected to a principle components analysis which was followed by a varimax rotation. A value of 1.0 was chosen to

be the commonality estimate and was the value placed on the diagonals of the correlation matrix. The number of factors subjected to the varimax rotation consisted of those factors whose eigenvalues were equal to 1.0 or greater. This resulted in a three-factor solution to the problem. Factor 1 accounts for 47% of the variance and can be identified as a visual factor. Factor 2 raises the cumulative proportion of the total variance to 57% and can be identified as an auditory factor. The third factor again raises the cumulative proportion of the total variance to 66% and can be identified as a closure factor.

Table 13 in Appendix A gives the factor loadings as a result of the varimax rotation for the three-factor solution. This table contains only those factors whose loadings were .60 or greater as these represented the variables which were relatively independent of the other two factors. Loadings below this .60 value tended to be distributed among two and also among three factors. Factor 1 includes visual association, visual reception, manual expression, and visual closure subtests. Factor 2 includes auditory sequential memory and sound blending, while Factor 3 is comprised mainly of the auditory closure, auditory association, grammatical closure, and visual sequential memory subtests.

Caldwell Preschool Inventory

An analysis of variance of the total Caldwell score revealed main effects of treatment but not of curriculum. The mean of the experimental group was 53.88, thus exceeding the control group mean of 45.54. The Duncan's New Multiple Range Test was applied to the differences between the means of the total scores (Table 14). The P9-C group ($\bar{X}$ = 41.88) scored significantly lower than the P9 group ($\bar{X}$ = 56.63) and the GE group (X = 56.75). There were no significant differences between curricula groups on the total score.

Each of the four subtests of the Caldwell was analyzed individually. An analysis of Subtest 1, Personal-Social Responsiveness, indicated a main effect of treatment. A Duncan's test revealed that the P9 group ($\bar{X}$ = 22.00) scored significantly higher than the P9-C group ($\bar{X}$ = 15.63) and the GE-C group ($\bar{X}$ = 16.63). The P3-C group ($\bar{X}$ = 19.63) scored significantly higher than the P9-C. There was no significant difference between the three curricula groups (Table 15).

On Subtest 2, Associative Vocabulary, and Subtest 3, Concept Activation-Numerical, an analysis of variance revealed no main effects of treatment or curriculum.

Subtest 4 is Concept Activation-Sensory. An analysis revealed main effects of treatment but not curriculum. The mean for the treatment group was 13.46 as compared with a mean of 10.29 for the control group. The Duncan's test indicated that the P9 group ($\bar{X}$ = 14.25) and the GE group ($\bar{X}$ = 14.00) scored significantly higher than any of the control groups ($\bar{X}$'s: GE-C = 10.25, P3-C = 10.38, P9-C = 10.25). There

were no significant differences between the three curricula groups or between the three control groups (Table 16). The GE and P9 curricula are seemingly effective in increasing sensory concept activation as measured by this subtest.

Englemann Concept Inventory Scale

There were no significant differences revealed on the analysis of variance of the total score of the Englemann test. The scores of Subtest 2 indicated that all the groups scored significantly higher than the P9-C group (Table 17). On Subtest 3, the GE group scored significantly higher than either of the Peabody control groups (Table 18). Generally speaking, all the children had a low rate of correct responses on this test; therefore, the test did not differentiate between groups.

Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test

The analysis of variance of the Metropolitan scores showed that there was a main effect of curriculum but not treatment. The results of the Duncan's test (Table 19) indicated that the P3 and P3-C groups scored significantly higher than the P9 group, the GE-C group, and the P9-C group. The mean of the GE group was below the means of the P3 and P3-C group and above the means of the other groups. It should be noted that all of the scores were very low, with a difference of only 6.12 points between the highest and lowest means.

A main effect of curriculum was evident in the analysis of Subtest 1, the only subtest which revealed any significant differences. The Duncan's test (Table 20) indicated that both P3 and P3-C groups scored significantly higher than the GE, GE-C, and P9 groups. In addition, the P3 group scored significantly higher than the P9-C group.

This test proved to be inappropriate for our population. The children were not able to perform any of the test items if the test was given in groups with general instructions. For this reason, the test was administered to each child individually, and directions for each test item were given. Thus, the validity of the results is questionable.

Overview of Results

All groups improved in performance on the second administration of the Binet, ITPA, and Caldwell. Therefore, the scores resulting from the second posttest were used in all subsequent analyses. Children receiving the Peabody and the general enrichment curricula performed better than their respective control groups on several dependent measures. The P9 group surpassed its control group on total scores of the Binet and the

Caldwell, on five subtests of the ITPA, and on two subtests of the Caldwell. The GE group performed better than its control group on two ITPA subtests, total ITPA score, and one Caldwell subtest. The P3 group did not perform better than its control group on any of the dependent measures.

When different curricula groups were compared, the P9 group did not differ from either the GE or the GE-C group on total scores of the Binet and Caldwell. This result is most impressive when considered in light of the finding that the GE and GE-C groups scored higher than both Peabody control groups on the Binet, and the GE group scored higher than the P9-C group on the Caldwell. On total ITPA score the GE group performed better than the P9 group, but there was no difference between scores of the P9 and the GE-C group, which again scored higher than the two Peabody control groups and also the P3 group.

Discussion

It will be helpful to precede the discussion of the external evaluation with some comments on the use of paraprofessionals, the Peabody materials, and the internal evaluation.

After three months of careful observation and feedback to our paraprofessional teachers, they were performing admirably. They quickly understood the principles of behavior modification and the importance of precise recording of a child's responses to particular tasks. We were lucky to have teachers who were bright, flexible, and appreciated constructive criticisms. It is probably more difficult to work with some professionally trained "traditional" early childhood educators who would actively resist the use of structured learning materials and behavior modification techniques. It was, however, very costly in terms of time for either observers or the project director to monitor the daily performance of the teachers and hold daily conferences with them concerning how they could improve their teaching skills. The Southeastern Educational Laboratory is presently using a sophisticated preservice training program for paraprofessional teachers rather than relying exclusively on an in-service training program.

In general, the Peabody materials accompanying Level #P possess two strengths: (1) they are very easy for paraprofessionals to use, and (2) the children found the lessons interesting. It should be recognized that we did not use the materials as they were designed -- i.e., a maximum of one lesson per day -- but covered as many lessons as possible each day for a concentrated teaching-learning session. This massed practice approach probably decreased the effectiveness of the lessons; obviously it would have been better, for example, to distribute the four hours of structured learning in group P9 across five days but the overall schedule of the Readimobile program made this impossible.

Our criticisms of the Peabody Level #P center around three issues -- (1) lesson objectives, (2) stimuli, and (3) organization of lessons. Since the lesson objectives are not made clear to the teacher it was necessary for us to isolate the specific lesson objectives or goals ourselves. The Southeastern Educational Lab is currently expanding the present recording system to include lesson objectives, a coding scheme, and a performance checklist. This approach will enable the teacher to keep accurate records herself on each child's progress through the Peabody lessons.

In order to devise a compact instructional "kit" the developers of the Peabody #P made some mistakes in the stimuli they selected. Only two examples are required to illustrate the problem. First,

the same cards are used to teach color, size, and number rather than separate stimuli that would not be confounded on each of the other dimensions. Our children were very confused until we resorted to "homemade" stimuli. Second, the records that accompany the materials have a major fault -- the recordings are very brief and an individual song is recorded only once. Since numerous exposures were required for the children to learn the songs, the teacher had to leave the group frequently to reset the recording. It would have been far better if each song had been recorded about five times.

The organization of the Peabody has two "flaws" which could be easily corrected. First, we are not convinced that enough consideration (or research) has been given to the sequencing of the lessons. Second, a frequency count of the type of lessons (e.g., classification, following directions, etc.) reveals that far more consideration is given to some activities at the expense of others. In general, we would recommend more activities for each "goal" and a more equitable distribution of activities across "goals."

The internal evaluation was designed to establish specific instructional goals or objectives for each lesson and to record every child's verbal and nonverbal responses as related to a particular instructional goal. (A sample performance recording sheet is included in the appendix.) To accomplish this task, two observers were present each day for the P9 group. After satisfactory (r = .95) interobserver reliabilities were obtained, each observer recorded the verbal and nonverbal behavior of four children. These responses were coded as either correct or incorrect so that the teacher could tell after any lesson how well the children had mastered the instructional goals. This careful recording and feedback to the teacher was probably one of the more valuable accomplishments of the project. If the children as a group did miserably, we would carefully examine the lesson or method of presentation and modify our approach. If an average child had not reached the criterion for successful performance, we could examine the lesson, method of presentation and/or repeat the lesson at a later date. Unfortunately, this evaluation does not approach the ideal of completely individualizing instruction; nevertheless, it assures that most of the children will succeed, and it guarantees that the teachers will have accurate records of the children's behavior.

Recognizing the previously mentioned problems of subject selection and experimental design, an examination of the results section reveals three primary findings and several secondary results. The primary results were: (1) the increase in test score performance of all groups on the second administration of three dependent measures; (2) the superiority of the P9 and GE experimental groups over their control groups on some of the dependent measures; and, (3) the effectiveness of the P9 curriculum in eliminating some of the well-documented differences between black lower class and white middle class children.

The increase in test score performance of all groups on the second administration of the Binet, ITPA and Caldwell can be interpreted as the

result of increased familiarity with the instrument and examiner. Zigler and Butterfield (1968) have cautioned against possible erroneous interpretations of changes in IQ scores. It may be that many reported IQ changes in preschool programs could be most parsimoniously interpreted as motivational and attitudinal changes rather than substantive cognitive changes. These data then add a new note of caution in interpreting change scores when using the ITPA and Caldwell. The interaction of treatment group and administration reported on the Caldwell highlights another problem -- different groups may experience differential profit from repeated testing on particular instruments. Frank Palmer of the Harlem Research Center in New York has exercised caution in his testing procedures to guarantee a positive rapport between the child and the examiner before any assessment begins. Dr. Palmer discovered two very interesting facts while working with two- and three-year-old children. First, it may take 10-15 hours of contact between the examiner and child before testing can begin. Second, the statistically significant correlation of a child's score on the Binet and the length of time before the child could be separated from his mother and testing could begin is high and negative. We should be concerned with controlling these noncognitive factors that may adversely affect a child's performance in a testing situation.

The P9 and GE experimental groups were superior to their control groups in several important instances. The P9 group was superior to its control group in total score on two of the major dependent measures -- Binet and Caldwell. Additionally, the P9 was superior to its control group on five subtests of the ITPA: Visual Association, Verbal Expression, Visual Closure, Auditory Sequential Memory, and Visual Sequential Memory.

The GE group was superior to its control group on the total ITPA scores, two ITPA subtests (Visual Closure and Visual Association) and one Caldwell subtest (Concept Activation-Sensory).

The lack of superiority of the P3 group on any of the dependent measures compared to its control group is easily explained by the brief exposure to an educational curriculum. The actual instructional time was only 48 hours (4 hours per week for 12 weeks) so it is not surprising that their performance did not improve. This group can probably best be viewed as a contact control group rather than as a meaningful treatment group.

The P9 group when compared to the GE or GE-C groups demonstrated the effectiveness of a structured preschool program in decreasing some of the well-documented differences between black and white children of different socio-economic classes. There were no statistically significant differences between the black lower socio-economic P9 children and the two white middle class groups, GE and GE-C, on the total scores of the Binet and Caldwell. This result is most impressive when considered in light of the finding that the GE and GE-C groups scored higher than both Peabody control groups on the Binet, and that the GE group surpassed

the P9-C group in performance on the Caldwell. On the total ITPA the P9 group was inferior to the GE group but not significantly different from the GE-C group which scored higher than the P9-C, P3, and P3-C groups. These facts provide support for the effectiveness of the P9 preschool program.

Three secondary results merit a brief discussion. First, in general, there were no significant differences between or among the groups on two dependent measures -- the Englemann Concept Inventory and the Metropolitan. An examination of the first 90 lessons of the Peabody should have led us to the early conclusion that our curricula were not designed to improve performance on the Englemann and probably not on the Metropolitan. In addition to the content, the directions of the Metropolitan proved too difficult for our population, and the test was administered to each child individually. The original intention was to test each child twice on the Metropolitan and the Englemann, but the examiners were convinced that the second administration would be a waste of time and money. The superior performance of the P3 and P3-C groups cannot be explained. However, this finding, quite different from results on the Binet, ITPA, and Caldwell, is not so disconcerting as it might have been, for all scores were low and standardized administration procedures had not been followed.

A second interesting result was the high positive correlations among the Binet, ITPA, and Caldwell. Obviously, it would be needless duplication for anyone in the future to use the Binet and the Caldwell together as general measures in evaluating a preschool program; they are so highly correlated that knowledge of one score provides enough information. It is time for either instrument developers to come to the aid of preschool research or preschool research to adopt another approach to evaluation. The latter suggestion appears preferable.

Another set of potentially helpful results are those connected with the ITPA scores. The magnitude of our S's scores was high (e.g., the subtests scores converted to psycholinguistic age for the P9 group ranged from 5 years 6 months to 8 years). Either we are dealing with children who are precocious psycholinguistically or the norms for the 1968 ITPA manual are poor. Most likely the norms need improvement. In addition, the results of the factor analysis of the ITPA fell somewhere between the extremes of other research on the ITPA which finds only one factor for black Southern children (see Don Steadman's work from the Educational Improvement Program at Duke) or more factors than our three (studies which have usually used upper middle class suburban white children).

In concluding the discussion section, a few comments are in order concerning research needs in preschool education and approaches to evaluation of preschool programs. It has been repeatedly demonstrated that some beneficial effects do indeed result from global intervention programs. We strongly believe that research efforts at this time which

compare only a treatment group and a distal control group using a pre-test-posttest design are archaic. First, in a successful program we don't know whether differences which appear are due to attitudinal and/or motivational changes rather than cognitive changes. A second confounding factor is implicit to the use of global intervention efforts. Even if the first consideration is partially excluded by employing contact control groups or completely excluded by using a contact control group and a Solomon Four Group design, then it is impossible to identify the particular antecedent conditions which produced the "success."

The present research effort represents, in several respects, an improvement over the usual attempt to evaluate the effectiveness of preschool programs. In reference to research design, the inclusion of two groups receiving the same treatment for different lengths of time allowed for some, although admittedly limited, assessment of time requirements in order for a program to have a beneficial impact. The comparison of two groups receiving different programs for equal periods of time gave indication of the relative influence of the two programs (although in this instance the effects were confounded across race and curriculum). Finally, the use of distal control Ss who were tested in a familiar location (i.e., their homes) and were compared to the experimental groups on the basis of test scores derived from a second administration of the dependent measures minimized the difference between groups which could be attributed to differences in attitudinal variables such as examiner-child rapport and location-determined anxiety. On the evaluation side, in addition to administering tests twice and employing a standardized test (ITPA) based upon the same theoretical position as one of the training programs (Peabody), several additional dependent measures were employed.

However, this design, too, leaves something to be desired. It appears that the most promising approach to program development and evaluation at this time would be concentration on specific instructional goals. An outline of the steps involved in the development, implementation, and evaluation of such a program follows:

1. Identify the instructional goals which are important for later academic success and/or lifetime functioning.

2. Using Gagne's task analysis approach, identify the prerequisite skills necessary for the attainment of each terminal instructional goal.

3. Develop the learning materials and learning experiences to teach the prerequisite skills, from the simplest to the desired terminal skill, insisting on criterion performance at each step.

4. Build evaluation measures (pretests, internal evaluations, and posttests) into each sequence of skills.

5. Define effective methods of delivering the program to various communities and populations.

The pretests would be used for psychoeducational diagnosis to pinpoint the "entry" skills of each child and to aid in instruction. The posttests should contain several clusters of items: (1) an alternate form of the pretest designed to measure the terminal instructional objectives; (2) "near" transfer tests (problems which incorporate the content used in instruction); (3) "far" transfer tests (problems which require use of the same logical structure but have different specific content); and (4) "farthest" transfer tests (problems presented in a different format and varying in content).

Concentration on developing programs to teach specific instructional goals lends a valuable versatility to preschool education efforts. Each learning sequence designed to teach skills in a particular area represents one "component" of an overall preschool "package." One might, for example, take a component like "classification skills" which appears embedded in almost all global preschool efforts (e.g., New Nursery, Deutsch, Weikart, etc.), and follow the above approach to develop a complete self-contained component to teach classification.

This "component" rather than "global" approach has several attractive features: (1) it guarantees an operational statement of the "input" (the Peabody materials are one of the few packages that state clearly what the preschool teacher is to do); (2) it provides for a careful, empirical evaluation of each component with instruments that accurately pinpoint a child's achievement before, during, and after instruction; and, (3) it provides the preschool teacher with the freedom to select components that are meaningful and important to her (ultimately, of course, research will identify the proper sequencing of components to attain a particular outcome). Components can be developed in numerous areas including, for example, number skills, perceptual and auditory discrimination, ordering, problem solving, and social skills. After seeing so many terrible "lessons" on "the family" or "Mommies" presented in preschool classes, we are convinced that someone must develop as many components as soon as possible if programs like Head Start are to really be more than socialization experiences for the participants. We have completed one component on multiple classification skills through all of the above steps; it is a very difficult, time consuming and costly approach. Its value, however, is that it is scientifically sound and may have a positive impact on preschool education.

References

Alpern, G. D. The failure of a nursery school enrichment program for culturally disadvantaged children. Paper presented at the regional meeting of American Association of Psychiatric Clinics for Children, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1966.

American Guidance Service. Peabody Language Development Kits (Levels #P, #K, #1, #2), Publishers' Building, Circle Pines, Minnesota.

Deutsch, M., Katz, I., & Jensen, A. Social class, race and psychological development. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1968.

The Durham Education Improvement Program, Duke University, 1966-67.

Elkind, D. Cognition in infancy and early childhood. In Y. Brackbill (Ed.), Infancy and early childhood. New York: Free Press, 1967. Pp. 361-394.

Ellis, N. R. (Ed.) Handbook of mental deficiency. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

ERIE, Eastern Regional Institute for Education, Progress and Plans, Syracuse, N. Y., 1968.

Glick, J. Some problems in the evaluation of preschool intervention programs. In R. Hess & R. Bear (Eds.), Early education. New York: Aldine Publishing Co., 1968. Pp. 215-221.

Gordon, I. Early child stimulation through parent education. Research proposal to Children's Bureau, February, 1967.

Guilford, J. P. The nature of human intelligence. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Hansen, D. Computer-assisted instruction. Review of Educational Research, 1966, 36, 588-603.

Helmuth, J. (Ed.) Disadvantaged child. Seattle: Special Child Publications, 1967.

Hess, R., & Bear, R. (Eds.) Early education. New York: Aldine Publishing Co., 1968.

Hunt, J. McV. Intelligence and experience. New York: Ronald Press, 1961.

Kirk, S. A., & McCarthy, J. J. The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities - an approach to differential diagnosis. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1961, 66, 399-412.

Madsen, Charles H., & Madsen, C. K. Discipline/teaching. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1970.

McGeoch, J. A., & Irion, A. L. The psychology of human learning. New York: McKay, 1952.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J, & Tannenbaum. The measurement of meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Palmer, F. H. Early intellectual training and school performance. Summary Progress Report, 1968, Institute for Child Development and Experimental Education, City University of New York (ED 025 324).

Parker, R. K., Ambron, S. A., Danielson, G. I., Halbrook, M. C., & Levine, J. A. Overview of cognitive and language programs for 3, 4, & 5 year old children. Center for Advanced Study in Education, The City University of New York, 1970.

Reidford, P. Recent developments in preschool education. In D. Brison & J. Hill (Eds.), Psychology and early childhood education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Monograph Series No. 4, 1968. Pp. 5-16.

Schaefer, E. Intellectual stimulation of culturally deprived infants. Proposal to NIMH, No. MH-09224-01, 1965.

Skinner, B. F. Verbal behavior. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

Swift, Joan W. Effects of early group experiences: the nursery school and day nursery. In M. Hoffman & L. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research, Vol. 1, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964. Pp. 249-288.

Toothman, R. The readimobile program, Southeastern Educational Corp., Atlanta, Georgia, 1968.

Torrance, E. P. Guiding creative talent. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Vergason, G. A. Retention in retarded and normal subjects as a function of amount of original training. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1964, 68, 623-629.

Webster, S. W. (Ed.) The disadvantaged learner. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1966.

White. S. H. Some educated guesses about cognitive development in the preschool years. In R. Hess and R. Bear (Eds.), Early education. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1968. Pp. 203-214.

Zigler, E., & Butterfield, E. C. Motivational aspects of changes in I.Q. tests performance of culturally deprived nursery school children. Child Development, 1968, 39, 1-14.



Histogram 1. A comparison of the three curricula groups, including their respective control groups, on the first and second administrations of the Caldwell Preschool Inventory.



Histogram 2. A comparison of the three curricula groups and their control groups on mean Stanford-Binet 10 scores.



Histogram 3. A comparison of the mean total ITPA scaled scores for each curriculum group and its control group.



Histogram 4. A comparison of the means of the General Enrichment group and its control group on the 12 subtests of the ITPA.



Histogram 5. A comparison of the means of the Peabody 9-month group and its control group on the 12 subtests of the ITPA.



Histogram 6. A comparison of the means of the Peabody 3-month group and its control group on the 12 subtests of the ITPA.



Histogram 7. Comparisons of the means of the General Enrichment, the Peabody 9-month, and the Peabody 3-month groups on the 12 subtests of the ITPA.



Histogram 8. A comparison of the means of the Peabody 9-month group and the General Enrichment control group on the 12 subtests of the ITPA.

TABLE 1

Test-Retest Reliability Coefficients

Between First And Second Administrations

Total Batteries

Stanford-Binet	.9093
Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities	.9061
Caldwell	.8621

Subtests of the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities

Auditory Reception	.5926
Visual Reception	.5281
Visual Sequential Memory	.5781
Auditory Association	.7848
Auditory Sequential Memory	.8238
Visual Association	.6525
Visual Closure	.7040
Verbal Expression	.6842
Grammatical Closure	.5267
Manual Expression	.7457
Auditory Closure	.7305
Sound Blending	.4855

Subtests of the Caldwell Preschool Inventory

1.	Personal-Social Responsiveness	.7362
2.	Associative Vocabulary	.6658
3.	Concept Activation-Numerical	.8082
4.	Concept Activation-Sensory	.8215

$p < .05$ if $r \geq .288$

$p < .01$ if $r \geq .372$

TABLE 2

Binet IQ - Second Administration

Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

of Differences Between Means

		P9-C	P3-C	P3	P9	GE-C	GE
Means		84.63	87.38	93.00	100.63	100.75	108.13
P9-C	84.63		2.75	8.37	16.00**	16.12**	23.50**
P3-C	87.38			5.62	13.25*	13.37*	20.75**
P3	93.00				7.63	7.75	15.13**
P9	100.63					.12	7.50
GE-C	100.75						7.38

P9-C P3-C P3 P9 GE-C GE

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

TABLE 3

Total ITPA Scaled Score - Second Administration

Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

of Differences Between Means

		P3-C	P9-C	P3	P9	GE-C	GE
Means		329.00	325.63	336.75	376.13	415.75	477.13
P3-C	329.00		6.63	7.75	47.13	86.75**	148.13**
P9-C	335.63			1.12	40.38	80.12**	141.50**
P3	336.75				39.38	79.00**	140.38**
P9	376.13					39.62	101.00**
GE-C	415.75						61.38*

P3-C P9-C P3 P9 GE-C GE

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

TABLE 4

Auditory Reception Scaled -
Second Administration

Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

of Differences Between Means

Means		P3 30.75	P3-C 32.00	P9-C 32.38	GE-C 35.50	P9 35.63	GE 38.75
P3	30.75		1.25	1.63	4.75	4.88	8.00**
P3-C	32.00			.38	3.50	3.63	6.75*
P9-C	32.38				3.12	3.25	6.37*
GE-C	35.50					.13	3.25
P9	35.63						3.12
		P3	P3-C	P9-C	GE-C	P9	GE

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

TABLE 5

Auditory Association Scaled -
Second Administration

Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

of Differences Between Means

Means		P9-C 28.25	P3 28.88	P3-C 29.63	P9 32.00	GE-C 32.88	GE 37.00
P9-C	28.25		.63	1.38	3.75	4.63	8.75**
P3	28.88			.75	3.12	4.00	8.12*
P3-C	29.63				2.37	3.25	7.37*
P9	32.00					.88	5.00
GE-C	32.88						4.12

	P9-C	P3	P3-C	P9	GE-C	GE

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

TABLE 6

Visual Association Scaled -
Second Administration

Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

of Differences Between Means

Means		P3-C 30.00	P9-C 30.75	P3 32.75	GE-C 33.63	P9 38.00	GE 40.75
P3-C	30.00		.75	2.75	3.63	8.00**	10.75**
P9-C	30.75			2.00	2.88	7.25**	10.00**
P3	32.75				.88	5.25	8.00**
GE-C	33.63					4.37	7.12*
P9	38.00						2.75

P3-C P9-C P3 GE-C P9 GE

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

TABLE 7

Verbal Expression Scaled -
Second Administration

Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

of Differences Between Means

Means		P9-C 33.13	GE-C 33.50	P3-C 34.63	P3 35.25	GE 37.13	P9 39.38
P9-C	33.13		.37	1.50	2.12	4.00	6.25*
GE-C	33.50			1.13	1.75	3.63	5.88
P3-C	34.63				.62	2.50	4.75
P3	35.25					1.88	4.13
GE	37.13						2.25

P9-C GE-C P3-C P3 GE P9

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

* $p < .05$

TABLE 8

Manual Expression Scaled -
Second Administration

Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

of Differences Between Means

Means		P9-C 32.88	P3-C 32.88	P3 35.25	GE-C 36.63	P9 38.13	GE 40.13
P9-C	32.88		.00	2.37	3.75	5.25	7.25*
P3-C	32.88			2.37	3.75	5.25	7.25*
P3	35.25				1.38	2.88	4.88
GE-C	36.63					1.50	3.50
P9	38.13						2.00

P9-C	P3-C	P3	GE-C	P9	GE

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

* $p < .05$

TABLE 9

Visual Closure Scaled -
Second Administration

Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

of Differences Between Means

Means		P9-C 39.25	P3-C 40.50	P3 42.37	GE-C 43.75	P9 48.13	GE 61.25
P9-C	39.25		1.25	3.12	4.50	8.88*	22.00**
P3-C	40.50			1.87	3.25	7.63	20.75**
P3	42.37				1.38	5.76	18.88**
GE-C	43.75					4.38	17.50**
P9	48.13						13.12**

P9-C P3-C P3 GE-C P9 GE

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

TABLE 10

Auditory Sequential Memory Scaled -
Second Administration

Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

of Differences Between Means

Means		GE 31.13	GE-C 31.75	P9-C 34.75	P3-C 35.38	P3 36.63	P9 42.50
GE	31.13		.62	3.62	4.25	5.50*	11.37**
GE-C	31.75			3.00	3.63	4.88	10.75**
P9-C	34.75				.63	1.88	7.75**
P3-C	35.38					1.25	7.12*
Pe	36.63						5.87

GE GE-C P9-C P3-C P3 P9

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

TABLE 11

Visual Sequential Memory Scaled -
Second Administration

Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

of Differences Between Means

Means		P9-C 27.63	P3 28.75	P3-C 31.00	GE-C 34.50	P9 35.38	GE 40.13
P9-C	27.63		1.12	3.37	6.87*	7.75**	12.50**
P3	28.75			2.25	5.75*	6.63*	11.38**
P3-C	31.00				3.50	4.38	9.13**
GE-C	34.50					.88	5.63
P9	35.38						4.75

P9-C	P3	P3-C	GE-C	P9	GE

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

TABLE 12

Auditory Closure Scaled -
Second Administration

Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

of Differences Between Means

Means		P3-C 29.63	P9-C 30.25	P3 30.25	P9 30.37	GE-C 32.88	GE 35.88
P3-C	29.63		.62	.62	.74	3.25	6.25*
P9-C	30.25			.00	.12	2.63	5.63*
P3	30.25				.12	2.63	5.63*
P9	30.37					2.51	5.51*
GE-C	32.88						3.00
		P3-C	P9-C	P3	P9	GE-C	GE

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

* $p < .05$

TABLE 13

Factor Analysis of ITPA Raw Scores
(N=48)

Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
.82 Vic. Assoc.	.87 Aud. Seq. Memory	.84 Aud. Closure
.73 Vis. Recept.	.72 Sound Blending	.68 Aud. Assoc.
.65 Manual Expr.		.63 Gramm. Closure
.60 Vis. Closure		.60 Vis. Seq. Mem.
Visual	Auditory	Closure

TABLE 14

Total Caldwell - Second Administration

Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

of Differences Between Means

		P9-C	GE-C	P3	P3-C	P9	GE
Means		41.88	44.63	48.25	50.13	56.63	56.75
P9-C	41.88		2.75	6.37	8.25	14.75*	14.87*
GE-C	44.63			3.62	5.50	12.00	12.12
P3	48.25				1.88	8.38	8.50
P3-C	50.13					6.50	6.62
P9	56.63						.12

P9-C GE-C P3 P3-C P9 GE

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

* $p < .05$

TABLE 15

Caldwell - Second Administration
Subtest 1: Personal-Social Responsiveness

Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

of Differences Between Means

		P9-C	GE-C	GE	P3	P3-C	P9
Means		15.63	16.63	18.63	19.50	19.63	22.00
P9-C	15.63		1.00	3.00	3.87*	4.00*	6.37**
GE-C	16.63			2.00	2.87	3.00	5.37**
GE	18.63				.87	1.00	3.37
P3	19.50					.13	2.50
P3-C	19.63						2.37

P9-C GE-C GE P3 P3-C P9

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

TABLE 16

Caldwell - Second Administration
Subtest 4: Concept Activation-Sensory

Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

of Differences Between Means

		P9-C	GE-C	P3-C	P3	GE	P9
Means		10.25	10.25	10.38	12.13	14.00	14.25
P9-C	10.25		.00	.13	1.88	3.75*	4.00*
GE-C	10.25			.13	1.88	3.75*	4.00*
P3-C	10.38				1.75	3.62*	3.87*
P3	12.13					1.87	2.12
GE	14.00						.25

P9-C GE-C P3-C P3 GE P9

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

* $p < .05$

TABLE 17

Englemann - Subtest 2

Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

of Differences Between Means

		P9-C	P3-C	GE-C	P9	P3	GE
Means		13.75	20.88	21.50	21.63	22.75	23.75
P9-C	13.75		7.13*	7.75*	7.88*	9.00**	10.00**
P3-C	20.88			.62	.75	1.87	2.87
GE-C	21.50				.13	1.25	2.25
P9	21.63					1.12	2.12
P3	22.75						1.00
		P9-C	P3-C	GE-C	P9	P3	GE

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

TABLE 18

Englemann - Subtest 3

Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

of Differences Between Means

Means		P3-C 7.38	P9-C 7.50	GE-C 8.00	P9 9.00	P3 9.00	GE 11.25
P3-C	7.38		.12	.62	1.62	1.62	3.87*
P9-C	7.50			.50	1.50	1.50	3.75*
GE-C	8.00				1.00	1.00	2.25
P9	9.00					1.00	2.25
P3	9.00						2.25

P3-C	P9-C	GE-C	P9	P3	GE

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

* $p < .05$

TABLE 19

Total Metropolitan - First Administration

Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

of Differences Between Means

		GE-C	P9	P9-C	GE	P3-C	P3
Means		20.13	21.50	21.88	22.63	25.75	26.25
GE-C	20.13		1.37	1.75	2.50	5.62*	6.12**
P9	21.50			.38	1.13	4.25*	4.75*
P9-C	21.88				.75	3.87*	4.37*
GE	22.63					3.12	3.62
P3-C	25.75						.50

GE-C	P9	P9-C	GE	P3-C	P3

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

TABLE 20

Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test - Subtest 1

Duncan's New Multiple Range Test

of Differences Between Means

		GE-C	P9	GE	P9-C	P3-C	P3
Means		4.88	5.25	6.00	6.38	8.25	9.63
GE-C	4.88		.37	1.12	1.50	3.37**	4.75**
P9	5.25			.75	1.13	3.00**	4.38**
GE	6.00				.38	2.25*	3.63**
P9-C	6.38					1.87	3.25**
P3-C	8.25						1.38

GE-C	P9	GE	P9-C	P3-C	P3

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

TABLE 21

Analysis of Variance of Binet I.Q.

Source	df	Sums of Squares	Mean Square	F
Treatment (T)	1	2370.09	2370.09	12.4666**
Curriculum (C)	2	4020.40	2010.20	10.5736***
T X C	2	484.19	242.09	1.2734
Error	42	7984.81	190.11	
Administration (A)	1	356.51	356.51	24.0320***
T X A	1	1.76	1.76	.1186
C X A	2	11.52	5.76	.3883
T X C X A	2	71.65	35.82	2.4147
Error	42	623.06	14.83	

** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

TABLE 22

Analysis of Variance of Illinois Test
of Psycholinguistic Abilities Raw Score

Source	df	Sums of Squares	Mean Square	F
Treatment (T)	1	13848.01	13848.01	6.3663*
Curriculum (C)	2	35697.56	17848.78	8.2055**
T X C	2	2887.77	1443.89	.6637
Error	42	91358.31	2175.20	
Administration (A)	1	6550.51	6550.51	86.6438***
T X A	1	68.34	68.34	.9039
C X A	2	223.52	111.76	1.4782
T X C X A	2	321.81	160.91	2.1283
Error	42	3175.31	75.60	

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

TABLE 23

Analysis of Variance of The
Caldwell Preschool Inventory

Source	df	Sums of Squares	Mean Square	F
Treatment (T)	1	1633.50	1633.50	6.4870*
Curriculum (C)	2	290.02	145.01	.5758
T X C	2	960.81	480.41	1.9078
Error	42	10576.00	251.81	
Administration (A)	1	504.17	504.17	25.3668***
T X A	1	.17	.17	.0083
C X A	2	138.52	69.26	3.4848*
T X C X A	2	23.40	11.70	.5885
Error	42	834.75	19.88	

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

TABLE 24

Analysis of Variance of Total Stanford-Binet IQ Scores
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	1250.521	1250.521	12.42**
Curriculum (C)	2	2173.042	1086.521	10.79**
T X C	2	309.042	154.521	1.53
Error	42	4229.875	100.71	
Total	47	7962.479		

** p < .01

TABLE 25

Analysis of Variance of Total Illinois Test of
Psycholinguistic Abilities Scaled Scores
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	10384.083	10384.083	4.24*
Curriculum (C)	2	2930.125	1465.063	21.01**
T X C	2	555.292	277.646	.11
Error	42	102877.500	2449.464	
Total	47	216747.000		

* p < .05
** p < .01

TABLE 26

Analysis of Variance of
Visual Reception Scaled Scores
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	184.083	184.083	8.57**
Curriculum (C)	2	12.667	6.334	.29
T X C	2	2.167	1.084	.05
Error	42	901.750	21.470	
Total	47	1100.667		

** $p < .01$

TABLE 27

Analysis of Variance of
Auditory Reception Scaled Scores
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	46.021	46.021	1.87
Curriculum (C)	2	144.542	72.271	2.94
T X C	2	96.542	48.271	1.97
Error	42	1030.875	24.545	
Total	47	1317.979		

TABLE 28

Analysis of Variance of
Auditory Association Scaled Scores
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	157.688	157.688	4.55*
Curriculum (C)	2	382.792	191.396	5.52**
T X C	2	40.875	20.438	.59
Error	42	1455.625	34.658	
Total	47	2036.979		

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 29

Analysis of Variance of
Visual Association Scaled Scores
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	52.083	52.083	1.13
Curriculum (C)	2	380.667	190.334	4.11*
T X C	2	11.167	5.584	.12
Error	42	1944.000	46.285	
Total	47	2387.917		

* $p < .05$

TABLE 30

Analysis of Variance of
Verbal Expression Scaled Scores
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	82,688	82.688	2.48
Curriculum (C)	2	113.042	56.521	1.67
T X C	2	82.125	41.063	1.23
Error	42	1399.625	33.324	
Total	47	1677.479		

TABLE 31

Analysis of Variance of
Manual Expression Scaled Scores
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	99.188	99.188	3.05
Curriculum (C)	2	214.542	107.271	3.30*
T X C	2	34.125	17.063	.53
Error	42	1364.625	32.491	
Total	47	1712.479		

* $p < .05$

TABLE 32

Analysis of Variance of
Grammatical Closure Scaled Scores
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	143.521	143.521	4.37*
Curriculum (C)	2	121.542	60.271	1.85
T X C	2	47.042	23.521	.72
Error	42	1377.875	32.806	
Total	47	1689.979		

* $p < .05$

TABLE 33

Analysis of Variance of
Visual Closure Scaled Scores
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	270.800	270.800	4.18*
Curriculum (C)	2	1559.592	779.796	12.05**
T X C	2	52.175	26.088	.40
Error	42	2717.200	64.695	
Total	47	4599.667		

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 34

Analysis of Variance of
Auditory Sequential Memory Scaled Scores
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	10.083	10.083	.29
Curriculum (C)	2	124.542	62.271	1.76
T X C	2	317.542	158.771	4.50*
Error	42	1483.500	35.321	
Total	47	1935.667		

* p $<$.05

TABLE 35

Analysis of Variance of
Visual Sequential Memory Scaled Scores
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	192.000	192.000	6.17*
Curriculum (C)	2	429.125	214.563	6.90**
T X C	2	9.375	4.688	.15
Error	42	1306.500	31.107	
Total	47	1937.000		

* p $<$.05
** p $<$.01

TABLE 36

Analysis of Variance of
Auditory Closure Scaled Scores
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	7.521	7.521	1.42
Curriculum (C)	2	273.500	136.750	2.42
T X C	2	51.167	25.584	2.42
Error	42	826.125	19.689	
Total	47	1158.313		

TABLE 37

Analysis of Variance of
Sound Blending Scaled Scores
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	46.021	46.021	1.45
Curriculum (C)	2	30.542	15.271	.48
T X C	2	81.792	40.886	1.29
Error	42	1329.625	31.658	
Total	47	1487.979		

TABLE 38

Analysis of Variance of Total Caldwell Scores
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	800.333	800.333	5.99*
Curriculum (C)	2	405.500	202.750	1.52
T X C	2	345.167	172.584	1.29
Error	42	5610.250	133.577	
Total	47	7161.250		

* p <.05

TABLE 39

Analysis of Variance of Caldwell--Subtest 1
Personal-Social Responsiveness
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	82.68750	8..68750	6.12365*
Curriculum (C)	2	.79167	.39583	.02931
T X C	2	21.37500	10.68750	.79149
Error	42	567.12500	13.50297	
Total	47	671.97917		

* p < .05

TABLE 40

Analysis of Variance of Caldwell--Subtest 2
Associative Vocabulary
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	126.75000	126.75000	7.80000**
Curriculum (C)	2	72.16667	36.08333	2.22051
T X C	2	144.50000	72.25000	4.44615
Error	42	682.50000	16.25000	
Total	47	1697.89584		

** p < .01

TABLE 41

Analysis of Variance of Caldwell--Subtest 3
Concept Activation- Numerical
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	52.08300	52.08300	.04723
Curriculum (C)	2	66.79167	33.39583	3.02861
T X C	2	14.04167	7.02083	.63671
Error	42	463.12500	11.02678	
Total	47	596.04134		

TABLE 42

Analysis of Variance of Caldwell--Subtest 4
Concept Activation- Sensory
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	93.52083	93.52083	6.88346*
Curriculum (C)	2	28.16667	14.08333	1.03658
T X C	2	22.16667	11.08333	.81577
Error	42	570.62500	13.58630	
Total	47	714.47917		

* $p < .05$

TABLE 43

Analysis of Variance of Total Englemann's and Bereiter's
Concept Development Scores
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	456.333	456.333	2.80
Curriculum (C)	2	21.125	10.563	.06
T X C	2	260.542	130.271	.80
Error	42	6843.250	162.934	
Total	47	7581.250		

TABLE 44

Analysis of Variance of Englemann's and Bereiter's Concept Inventory Scale--Subtest 1

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	.02083	.02083	.00037
Curriculum (C)	2	235.54167	117.77083	2.08060
T X C	2	88.04167	44.02083	.77770
Error	42	2377.37500	56.60416	
Total	47	2700.97917		

TABLE 45

Analysis of Variance of Englemann's and Bereiter's Concept Inventory Scale--Subtest 2

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	192.00000	192.00000	4.40355*
Curriculum (C)	2	224.29167	112.14583	2.57208
T X C	2	90.37500	45.18750	1.03638
Error	42	1831.25000	43.60119	
Total	47	2337.91667		

*p $<$ .05

TABLE 46

Analysis of Variance of Englemann's and Bereiter's Concept Inventory Scale--Subtest 3

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	54.18750	54.18750	6.55164*
Curriculum (C)	2	21.12500	10.56250	1.27708
T X C	2	7.62500	3.81250	.46096
Error	42	347.37500	8.27083	
Total	47	430.31250		

* $p < .05$

TABLE 47

Analysis of Variance of Englemann's and Bereiter's Concept Inventory Scale--Subtest 4

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	2.08333	2.08333	.35035
Curriculum (C)	2	18.87500	9.43750	1.58709
T X C	2	9.29167	4.64583	.78128
Error	42	249.75000	5.94642	
Total	47	280.00000		

TABLE 48

Analysis of Variance of
Total Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test
(First Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	9.188	9.188	.86
Curriculum (C)	2	213.792	106.896	10.05**
T X C	2	17.375	8.688	.82
Error	42	446.625	10.634	
Total	47	686.979		

** p < .01

TABLE 49

Analysis of Variance of
Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test--Subtest 1

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	2.52083	2.52083	.96579
Curriculum (C)	2	118.16667	59.08333	22.63626**
T X C	2	15.16667	7.58333	2.90536
Error	42	109.62500	2.61011	
Total	47	245.47917		

** p < .01

TABLE 50

Analysis of Variance of
Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test--Subtest 2

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	7.52083	7.52083	1.94834
Curriculum (C)	2	15.04167	7.52083	1.94834
T X C	2	8.79167	4.39583	1.13878
Error	42	162.12500		
Total	47	193.47917		

TABLE 51

Analysis of Variance of
Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test--Subtest 3

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	.75000	.75000	.15889
Curriculum (C)	2	23.79167	11.89583	2.52018
T X C	2	9.87500	4.93750	1.04603
Error	42	198.25000	4.72023	
Total	47	232.66667		

TABLE 52

Analysis of Variance of
Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test--Subtest 4

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	.18750	.18750	.12475
Curriculum (C)	2	9.29167	4.64583	3.09109
T X C	2	.87500	.43750	.29109
Error	42	63.12500	1.50297	
Total	47	73.47917		

TABLE 53

Analysis of Variance of
Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test--Subtest 5

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	.02083	.02083	.15556
Curriculum (C)	2	.54167	.27083	2.02222
T X C	2	.29167	.14583	1.08889
Error	42	5.62500	.13392	
Total	47	6.47917		

TABLE 54

Analysis of Variance of Total Stanford-Binet IQ Scores
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	1121.333	1121.333	10.76**
Curriculum (C)	2	1858.875	929.438	8.92**
T X C	2	246.792	123.396	1.18
Error	42	4378.000	104.238	
Error	47	7605.000		

** p < .01

TABLE 55

Analysis of Variance of Total Illinois Test of
Psycholinguistic Abilities Scaled Scores
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	16023.521	16023.521	6.60*
Curriculum (C)	2	15344.042	7672.021	23.76**
T X C	2	5845.292	2922.646	1.20
Error	42	101932.625	2426.967	
Total	47	239145.479		

* p < .05
** p < .01

TABLE 56

Analysis of Variance of
Auditory Reception Scaled Scores
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	36.750	36.750	1.59
Curriculum (C)	2	265.167	132.583	5.72**
T X C	2	54.000	27.000	1.17
Error	42	972.750	28.269	
Total	47	1328.667		

** p < .01

TABLE 57

Analysis of Variance of
Visual Reception Scaled Scores
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	96.333	96.333	3.22
Curriculum (C)	2	27.125	13.562	.45
T X C	2	53.792	26.896	.90
Error	42	1254.750		
Total	47	1432.000		

TABLE 58

Analysis of Variance of
Auditory Association Scaled Scores
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	67.687	67.687	1.72
Curriculum (C)	2	300.125	150.063	3.82*
T X C	2	58.875	29.438	.75
Error	42	1651.125	39.313	
Total	47	2077.812		

* $p < .05$

TABLE 59

Analysis of Variance of
Visual Association Scaled Scores
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	391.021	391.021	7.87**
Curriculum (C)	2	270.375	135.188	2.72
T X C	2	52.542	26.271	.53
Error	42	2086.375		
Total	47	2800.313		

** $p < .01$

TABLE 60

Analysis of Variance of
Verbal Expression Scaled Scores
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	147.000	147.000	5.40*
Curriculum (C)	2	14.625	7.313	.27
T X C	2	63.375	21.688	1.16
Error	42	1143.000	32.571	
Total	47	1368.000		

* $p < .05$

TABLE 61

Analysis of Variance of
Manual Expression Scaled Scores
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	165.021	165.021	6.63*
Curriculum (C)	2	154.292	77.146	3.10
T X C	2	16.792	8.396	.34
Error	42	1044.875	32.880	
Total	47	1380.979		

* $p < .05$

TABLE 62

Analysis of Variance of
Grammatical Closure Scaled Scores
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	120.383	120.383	3.97
Curriculum (C)	2	151.217	75.608	2.49
T X C	2	155.217	77.608	2.56
Error	42	1273.200	30.314	
Total	47	1699.917		

TABLE 63

Analysis of Variance of
Visual Closure Scaled Scores
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	1064.133	1064.133	16.12**
Curriculum (C)	2	1093.925	546.863	8.28**
T X C	2	490.092	245.046	3.71*
Error	42	2773.200	66.029	
Total	47	5421.250		

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

TABLE 64

Analysis of Variance of
Auditory Sequential Memory Scaled Scores
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	93.521	93.521	3.26
Curriculum (C)	2	423.292	211.646	7.39**
T X C	2	154.542	77.271	2.70
Error	42	1203.625	28.658	
Total	47	1874.979		

** p < .01

TABLE 65

Analysis of Variance of
Visual Sequential Memory Scaled Scores
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	165.021	165.021	5.78*
Curriculum (C)	2	489.292	244.646	8.56**
T X C	2	222.042	111.021	2.89
Error	42	1198.125	28.527	
Total	47	2074.479		

* p < .05
** p < .01

TABLE 66

Analysis of Variance of
Auditory Closure Scaled Scores
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	18.750	18.750	.86
Curriculum (C)	2	193.792	96.896	4.46*
T X C	2	18.875	9.437	.43
Error	42	912.500	21.726	
Total	47	1143.917		

* $p < .05$

TABLE 67

Analysis of Variance of
Sound Blending Scaled Scores
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	22.688	22.688	.63
Curriculum (C)	2	12.875	6.438	.18
T X C	2	45.125	22.563	.63
Error	42	1508.125	35.908	
Total	47	1588.813		

TABLE 68

Analysis of Variance of Total Caldwell Scores
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	833.333	833.333	6.03*
Curriculum (C)	2	23.042	11.521	.08
T X C	2	639.042	319.521	2.31
Error	42	5800.500	138.107	
Total	47	7295.917		

* $p < .05$

TABLE 69

Analysis of Variance of Caldwell--Subtest 1
Personal-Social Responsiveness
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	90.75000	90.75000	6.91115*
Curriculum (C)	2	30.54167	15.27083	1.16296
T X C	2	87.87500	43.93750	3.34610
Error	42	551.50000	13.13095	
Total	47	760.66217		

* $p < .05$

TABLE 70

Analysis of Variance of Caldwell--Subtest 2
Associative Vocabulary
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	46.02083	46.02083	3.75772
Curriculum (C)	2	1.12500	.56250	.04593
T X C	2	78.79167	39.39583	3.21677
Error	42	514.37500	12.24702	
Total	47	640.31250		

TABLE 71

Analysis of Variance of Caldwell--Subtest 3
Concept Activation- Numerical
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	1.68750	1.68750	.15676
Curriculum (C)	2	63.87500	31.93750	2.96682
T X C	2	52.12500	26.06250	2.42107
Error	42	452.12500	10.76488	
Total	47	569.81250		

TABLE 72

Analysis of Variance of Caldwell--Subtest 4
Concept Activation- Sensory
(Second Administration)

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Treatment (T)	1	120.33333	120.33333	12.17098**
Curriculum (C)	2	9.50000	4.75000	.48043
T X C	2	12.16667	6.08333	.61529
Error	42	415.25000	9.88690	
Total	47	557.25000		

** p < .01

TABLE 73

Correlations of The Subtests of The
Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities
(Second Administration - Scaled Scores)

	Aud. Rec.	Vis. Rec.	Vis.Seq. Mem.	Aud. Assoc.	Aud.Seq. Mem.	Vis. Assoc.	Vis. Clos.	Verbal Exp.	Gram. Clos.	Man. Exp.	Aud. Clos.	Sound Blendg.	Total
Auditory Reception	1.0000												
Visual Reception	.5118	1.0000											
Visual Sequential Memory	.5360	.3037	1.0000										
Auditory Association	.6972	.4786	.5988	1.0000									
Auditory Sequential Memory	.2447	.3158	.1545	.2278	1.0000								
Visual Association	.6213	.5835	.5591	.5760	.3355	1.0000							
Visual Closure	.5209	.2889	.6675	.5654	.1704	.5836	1.0000						
Verbal Expression	.4643	.2879	.3446	.3829	.4636	.5015	.5769	1.0000					
Grammatical Closure	.6399	.5313	.5877	.8070	.3164	.6448	.6451	.4590	1.0000				
Manual Expression	.6055	.5486	.4643	.5699	.2358	.5570	.5281	.5242	.5375	1.0000			
Auditory Closure	.6730	.2680	.5380	.6464	.0763	.4357	.6065	.4397	.5873	.5590	1.0000		
Sound Blending	.4167	.3497	.3259	.4102	.2382	.3608	.4657	.2750	.4872	.3713	.4366	1.0000	
Total	.7513	.4834	.7443	.7711	.1008	.6709	.7862	.4326	.7526	.6547	.7595	.3938	1.0000

$p < .05$ if $r \geq .288$
$p < .01$ if $r \geq .372$

TABLE 74

Correlations of the Subtests of The
Caldwell Preschool Inventory

(Second Administration)

	Per.-Soc. Resp.	Assoc. Vocab.	Con.Act.-Num.	Con.Act.-Sens.
Personal-Social Responsiveness	1.0000			
Associative Vocabulary	.6591	1.0000		
Concept Activation-Numerical	.3721	.6249	1.0000	
Concept Activation-Sensory	.7081	.6594	.5441	1.0000

$p < .05$ if $r \geq .288$
$p < .01$ if $r \geq .372$

PERFORMANCE RECORDING SHEET
[illegible]KULLA COUNTY READIMOBILE PRESCHOOL

DATE_____ TEACHER_____
OBSERVER_____

1. LESSON NO. _____ TITLE _____

Specific lesson objective(s):
A.
B.
C.
D.

2. Lesson adequacy: Satisfactory _____ Unsatisfactory_____
Specific suggestions for improvement:

3. Teacher presentation: Satisfactory _____ Unsatisfactory_____
Specific suggestions for improvement:

4. Children's Responses
Code for each response:
Correct Verbalization = V Correct Nonverbal = /
Incorrect Verbalization = V Incorrect Nonverbal = X

Code for overall lesson evaluation:
Child comprehends lesson objective = √
Some comprehension, needs additional work = ?
Very little comp., needs "branching" = O

Specific Lesson Objectives

Child's Name	A	B	C	D

5. Additional Comments: